

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated October 21, 2003 has been received and considered by the Applicant. Claims 1 through 9 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1, through 9 stand rejected by the Final Office Action dated October 21, 2003.

The Final Office Action suggests that headings be placed on the various sections of the specification to the present invention. The Applicant respectfully declines to add the heading suggested by the Examiner because they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

The Office Action rejects claims 1 through 7 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,878,223 issued in the name of Becker et al. (Becker et al.). "To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either explicitly or inherently." In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The applicant would like to, respectfully, point out that the rejected claims to the present invention recite elements defining a device (100) that operates to prefetch elements from resources. The Applicant would like to also, respectfully, point out that Becker et al. discloses a system and method for catching information pages wherein the resource attempts to predict the most likely page to be selected and queries the requestor permission to send the predicted page from the resource to the device (see FIG. 4A-1 and 4A-2). There is no scenario within the present invention as recited by the rejected claims wherein a resource that is accessed by a device queries the device for permission to send a page that has been predicted by the resource as taught by that Becker et al. (see FIG. 4A-1, reference numerals 235 and 240). Additionally, Becker et al. discloses that an interim computer 140 can send the predicted-to-be-selected pages to the requesting computer. The Applicants would like to respectfully point out that the requesting computer of Becker et al. is equivalent to the device recited by the rejected claims of the present invention.

Specifically, the Applicant would like to draw the Examiner's attention to rejected Claim 4 of the present invention that recites a device (100) for prefetching a referenced resource. The Applicant would like to, respectfully, point out that the device (100) recited by rejected Claim 4 is equivalent to requestor within the disclosure of Becker et al. and that the requestor within Becker et al. does not provide any prediction capabilities. The device (100) recited by rejected Claim 4 includes link determination means (110) for determining a group of

references (107) to resources from a given first resource (106) link weighting means (111) for computing, for each reference (107) to a resource in the group, a respective weight and assigning it to the reference (107). The Applicant would like to, respectfully, point out that nowhere within Becker et al., does the requestor provide any equivalent to the link weighting means within the requestor. The Examiner has cited a reference (Becker et al.) that teaches resources that employ prediction tables, however, this reference does not provide any teaching for requesting devices that provide prefetching capabilities as recited by rejected Claim 4 to the present invention. The device (100) of rejected Claim 4 also recites choosing means (112) for choosing from the group a first reference having a maximal respective weight, which is not disclosed, or suggested, as being part of the requestor of Becker et al. Rejected Claim 4 also recites prefetching means (113) for prefetching a resource referenced by that first reference, wherein the link weighting means (111) are arranged to compute the respective weight for a reference (107) based on the number of times (202) the resource referenced by that reference (107) has been fetched previously, and on the number of times (203) one or more further resources have been fetched previously from a server (102,103,104) that serves the resource referenced by the reference (107). As previously stated, the prediction table taught by Becker et al. is not a function that is performed by the requestor. Moreover, the requestor does not do the prefetching as disclosed by Becker et al. (note that the requestor of Becker et al. is equivalent to the device 100 with rejected Claim 4). The resource server does prefetching as taught by Becker et al. Rejected Claim 4 recites a device that accesses a resource. Becker et al. relates to a resource.

Furthermore, Becker et al. specifically teaches that the requestor has an option of declining the prediction provided by the resource server, which illustrates the fundamental differences between Becker et al. and the rejected claims to the present invention. The present invention, simply put, does not relate to a resource destination on a network (such as the WEB) that provides predictions to devices searching the WEB. The present invention, relates to devices that access resources on a network (the WEB) and prefetches pages weighting parameters contained within the device. Becker et al. discloses prefetching options supplied from a resource to an accessing device, which is fundamentally different from the invention as recited by the rejected claims to present invention.

The Examiner states that Becker et al. teaches the elements who recited by the

rejected claims to the present invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that column 9 and column 10 of Becker et al. discloses all the elements of the rejected claims.

Becker et al. teaches a prediction table that contains the probability that the page will be selected relative to the current page that is selected (see column 9, lines 29-45). The present invention, as recited by the rejected claims, defines a method and apparatus for prefetching resources based on the number of times that resource has been referenced by source and the number of times of the resources have been referenced from the same source. The prefetching of the present invention as recited by the rejected claims does not compute a probability that a resource will be referenced based upon the current resource that is referenced. Therefore, the recited elements to the rejected claims are not found within the cited reference, Becker et al. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has refuted the Applicant's arguments regarding claim 3 and 6 by asserting that column 10, lines 47-55 of Becker et al. discloses the subject matter recited by these rejected claims. The Applicant at would like to respectfully point out that column 10, lines 47-55 of Becker et al. relates to probability values that are used to generate predictions that are transmitted from a resource to a requesting device, which prediction may or may not be accepted by the requesting device. Rejected Claims 3 and 6 relate to weighting procedures that are performed with the requesting device, which weighting procedures are performed by the requesting device, not the resource as taught by Becker et al. Moreover, rejected Claim 3 and 6 specifically recite that the weight is calculated from keywords within the description to a reference. Column 10, lines 47-55 of Becker et al. discloses that weighting can be accomplished by various categories, however, the cited section of Becker et al. does not make any mention of using keywords from the description of the resource in weighting. The recited elements to rejected claims 3 and 6 are not found within cited reference, Becker et al. Therefore, Becker et al cannot anticipate claims 3 and 6 to the present invention. Moreover, there is no suggestion to modify the teachings of Becker et al to use keywords within the reference weighting process that is taught, therein.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes that issues contained within the Final Office Action have been addressed and that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By James D. Leimbach

James D. Leimbach, Reg. 34,374
Patent Attorney (585) 381-9983

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA. 22313-1450

on: December 8, 2003

(Mailing Date)

James D. Leimbach
(Signature)